#### **OPINION 655**

# BLANKAARTIA OUDEMANS, 1911 (ACARINA): ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES

**RULING.**—(1) It is hereby Ruled that the valid type-species of *Blankaartia* Oudemans, 1911, is in fact *Trombidium niloticum* Trägårdh, 1905 (as designated by Oudemans) in spite of the fact that Oudemans based his genus on a larva which has been shown to represent quite another species.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of

Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

 (a) Blankaartia Oudemans, 1911 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Trombidium niloticum Trägårdh, 1905 (Name No. 1534);

- (b) Pseudoblankaartia Fuller & Wharton, 1951 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Pseudoblankaartia bequaerti Fuller & Wharton, 1951 (Name No. 1535).
- (3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
  - (a) niloticum Trägårdh, 1905, as published in the binomen Trombidium niloticum (type-species of Blankaartia Oudemans, 1911) (Name No. 1894);
  - (b) bequaerti Fuller & Wharton, 1951, as published in the binomen Pseudoblankaartia bequaerti (type-species of Pseudoblankaartia Fuller & Wharton, 1951) (Name No. 1895).
- (4) The generic name *Tragardhula* Berlese, 1912 (a junior objective synonym of *Blankaartia* Oudemans, 1911) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1629.

## HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 330)

The present problem was first submitted to the office of the Commission by Prof. H. S. Fuller and Prof. G. Wharton in December 1947. The detailed history of the case is recounted in a Report prepared by the Assistant Secretary to the Commission, Dr. W. E. China. Dr. China's paper was sent to the printer on 4 March 1960, and was published on 16 September 1960 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 301–312. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4: 51–56).

Comments on the case were received from Dr. D. A. Crossley and Dr. Robert Domrow (Bull. 2001. Nomencl. 18: 176) and from Dr. R. V. Southcott, Dr. J. R. Audy and Prof. G. Wharton. The comments of the last three, not having been published in the Bulletin, were circulated to the Commission at the time of Voting.

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 1 December 1961 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (61)33 either for or against the use of the plenary powers to designate a type-species for the nominal genus Blankaartia Oudemans, 1911, as set out in the proposals published in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 311–312.

On 2 April 1962 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (62)9 on the same subject. With that Voting Paper the following Report was circulated to the Commission:

"Voting Paper (61)33, issued on 1 December 1961, was concerned with the determination of the type-species of Blankaartia Oudemans, 1911. The application was published in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 301–312. Alternative proposals were placed before the Commission: the proposal presented in paragraph 24 on page 311 was that Blankaartia should be interpreted strictly according to the Code; the proposal presented in paragraph 25 on pages 311–312 was that the plenary powers should be used to designate another type-species for the genus.

"On 1 March 1962, the end of the prescribed Voting Period for Voting Paper (61)33, fourteen (14) Commissioners had voted for the use of the plenary

powers to designate a type-species for Blankaartia:

Evans, Holthuis, Hering, Riley, Obruchev, Alvarado, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Brinck, Uchida, do Amaral, Borchsenius, Tortonese, Poll.

"Nine Commissioners had voted for the adoption of the proposals not involving the use of the plenary powers:

Vokes, Mayr, Jaczewski, Munroe, Lemche, Stoll, Key, Mertens, Miller.

"Commissioners Boschma, Hemming and Prantl did not return their

Voting Papers and Commissioner Bradley was on Leave of Absence.

"The proposal involving the use of the plenary powers, therefore, whilst having gained the majority vote has not obtained the two-thirds majority necessary for a plenary powers decision of the Commission. In accordance therefore with the Commission's By-Laws, the vote taken on Voting Paper (61)33 is treated as a preliminary vote only and the proposals are now resubmitted, on Voting Paper (62)9, for a final decision. If less than two out of three Commissioners voting on V.P.(62)9 vote in favour of the use of the plenary powers to designate a type-species for *Blankaartia* (para. 25) then the Rules shall be strictly applied and the alternative set out in para. 24 shall be treated as the alternative adopted by the Commission.

"In returning Voting Paper (61)33 Dr. Key made the following comment:

'Article 70(a) differs from the rule recognised prior to the London Congress and quoted by Mr. Hemming, and by you in your paragraph 23 (Bulletin, pp. 310-311), in that it requires the Commission to designate as type-species "whichever species will in its judgment best serve stability and uniformity of nomenclature" (Article 70) and not necessarily "the species intended by the original author" (your para. 23). Thus the principal concern of the Commission must be to determine which solution will best serve stability and uniformity.

'In spite of the conflict of opinion among the specialists, the balance of the evidence seems to me to favour the view that the solution set out in paragraph 24 will better serve stability and uniformity, especially when we consider usage in the important works published since 1951'.".

On 2 July 1962, at the close of the prescribed Voting Period on Voting

Paper (62)9, the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—thirteen (13), received in the following order: Hering, do Amaral, Obruchev, Boschma, Evans, Alvarado, Borchsenius, Uchida, Tortonese, Riley, Brinck, Kühnelt, Bonnet.

Negative Votes—ten (10): Vokes, Jaczewski, Munroe, Mayr, Key, Lemche,

Miller, Mertens, Bradley, Stoll.

On Leave of Absence—two (2): Holthuis, Prantl.

Commissioners Poll and Hemming returned late votes in favour of the use of

the plenary powers.

Professor J. Chester Bradley returned the following comment with his Voting Paper: "Where specialists disagree as to the best solution the plenary powers should not be used, especially in the case when the applicants themselves feel that the general importance of the case does not warrant their use".

Since on this, the second Voting Paper to be issued in this case, there was not a two-thirds majority of the Commission in favour of the use of the plenary powers, the Rules have been strictly applied and the alternative set out in paragraph 24 of Dr. China's Report has been considered to have been adopted.

#### ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

bequaerti, Pseudoblankaartia, Fuller & Wharton, 1951, Psyche 58(2): 85–88 Blankaartia Oudemans, 1911, Ent. Berichten 3(57): 123

niloticum, Trombidium, Trägårdh, 1905, Results Swedish zool. Exp. Egypt and White Nile, 1901, II: 78-82

Pseudoblankaartia Fuller & Wharton, 1951,  $Psyche~\bf 58(2)$ : 85–88

Tragardhula Berlese, 1912, Redia 8: 4

### CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Papers (61)33 and (62)9 were cast as set out above, that the proposals set out in the latter Voting Paper as the second alternative has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 655.

W. E. CHINA Acting Secretary International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature London 9 July 1962